

1970 to 1992. Since 1980, juvenile gang killings have increased 371 percent, and the rate of recidivism for juveniles runs as high as 75 percent. In fact, the FBI shows that before someone goes to jail as a juvenile, he usually commits 15 different offenses that have gone by unpunished.

One of the big problems is that the age group of the drug pushers who are in their mid-20s go out and recruit the very, very young kids for the most dangerous, the most risky part of their business, and they consider these kids both expendable and impressionable. You can get them to do things that older and smarter folks would not want to do. So when there is a turf war, usually the casualties are your 16 and 17-year-olds.

The next question, the final thing I want to touch base on, Mr. Maier says are we actually winning the drug war. And a lot of people will point out the fact that we are grabbing more marijuana and drugs as they come into our country. Although it would depend on what statistic you look at, we are probably grabbing as little as 15 percent of what is actually coming into our country from south of the border. And one of the things that has happened, because there has been a de-escalation in terms of prosecutions, that the drug dealers are actually more set in, and their territories are somewhat established because they are not gunning it out any more.

This is a real interesting article on crime. I think that what Mr. Maier does is raise some things that we in public policy need to consider. I believe that this Congress should continue to go in the direction that it has: Full sentencing of 10 years means 10 years. If someone is in jail they need to have a work program. No more sitting around watching TV, lifting weights and playing basketball. It means also the work that they do should be meaningful. It should be skill building, so that when they get out they can utilize that into a paying job.

I think also there should be an education program. I believe that a lot of these people who are in jail are intelligent but, somewhere along the line, they dropped out of school. They had a problem. They need to have that second chance while they are in jail, tied in with good behavior or whatever, but give them that opportunity.

Finally, I do think there needs to be spiritual rehabilitation, because I think that is the beginning of real rehabilitation for anyone behind bars. I believe that taking these steps, sending out the message that we are serious, that a person cannot just be caught selling drugs and get their hand slapped any more, I think if we continue on this path, that our crime rates will continue the downward trend.

□ 1930

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the Majority Leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a lot of the issues that are facing the country today and what we are hearing about as it relates to the President's budget plan. I rise in particular to talk about an issue that I think many of our senior citizens, many of our folks in their 50s and 40s and many of our young people are also concerned about, and that is Social Security.

My son, who mowed lawns last summer and earned a reasonable amount of money doing it, like \$1,500, because he did a lot of them, talked to me about whether or not he should pay any taxes on it. And, of course, for a young person in their teenage years who mowed lawns last summer and earned some money, there is no Federal taxes due. But then I said to him, "You still have got to file, Matt; you have still got to file a tax return."

And my 15-year-old son, who is going to file his tax return, has to pay into the Social Security Trust Fund. As a matter of fact, he found that he paid over about 15 percent of all of his earnings into the Social Security Trust Fund because he would be treated as a self-employed person.

So when we talk about the Social Security issue, it is certainly very important to our young people to understand very clearly that they are putting this money away for retirement. But, in fact, it does not seem to affect them because they do not believe Social Security is going to be there for them; and they are certainly, at age 15, are not very interested in thinking ahead to retirement. They are more interested buying a car and their college education than they are in thinking ahead to retirement.

So when we think about this Social Security issue, I start with the younger group to understand that it does have an impact on them. When we get to the folks in their 30s and 40s, they are putting this money away. It is being taken out of their paychecks. But instead of being put away in a fund for them, it goes into the Social Security Trust Fund.

I would like to spend a little time tonight talking about how the United States Government handles this money that is being taken out of their paychecks and how that affects our senior citizens and the potential of Social Security actually being there for them when they reach the retirement age.

If I could ask one of our pages to bring that stand over, I brought a couple of pictures with me.

For any of my colleagues that have seen these numbers before, we took the time today to update the Social Security numbers so that it reflects what is actually going on in the Social Security system in 1998.

This whole thing becomes relatively easy to understand as it relates to So-

cial Security if we just take a look at how much money is actually coming in and how much is going out to our senior citizens in Social Security.

Virtually every worker that has a paycheck has money taken out of their paycheck for Social Security. Altogether, the United States Government in 1998 will collect about \$480 billion in Social Security money from the paychecks of workers in America. The Social Security system will write out checks to our senior citizens of \$382 billion.

This is pretty straightforward. They are collecting \$480 billion, and they are paying \$382 billion out to our senior citizens. That leaves a \$98 billion surplus. That is to say, they are collecting \$98 billion more than they are paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits.

That money is supposed to be put away. It is supposed to be put into a savings account so that when they are, these two numbers turn around, the baby-boom generation is clearly headed toward retirement, and eventually we reach a point where there is not enough money in and too much money being written out in checks to our senior citizens. Well, this money that is supposed to be put away in a savings account today is not actually happening today.

I would like to talk about this and the reference of what the President referred to in his budget address and something that many of us in this Congress feel very strongly about.

That \$98 billion that came in goes directly into the big government checkbook, the general fund. Now we spend all the money out of the general fund, and when we are all done spending that money there is not enough money left to put the \$98 billion down in the Social Security Trust Fund. So, instead, what our Government does is it makes an accounting entry and simply puts an IOU down here in the Social Security Trust Fund.

The technical name for this is a non-negotiable Treasury bond. But the bottom line is that \$98 billion of surplus goes straight into the big government checkbook. They spend all the money out of the big government checkbook, and there is nothing left to put in the Social Security Trust Fund. So they simply make an accounting entry. It is called a nonnegotiable Treasury bond that goes down here.

It is important to understand what nonnegotiable Treasury bond means. Nonnegotiable Treasury bonds means it cannot be sold.

So when we come back to this other picture and we take a look at what happens down the road a little ways when the baby-boom generation gets here, remember the revenues, the amount of money that is coming in today, is higher than the amount of money that is being paid out to our seniors in benefits. So today it works.

The idea is that when those two numbers turn around, there is not enough

money coming in, we are supposed to be able to go to this trust fund and get the money to make good on the Social Security payments. The problem is this: Since that trust fund is full of IOUs, or nonnegotiable, nonmarketable, something you cannot sell, it is full of IOUs, and since it is full of IOUs, when the time comes that there is not enough money coming in and too much going out, where is the money going to come from? And at that point in time, we reach the point where we either have to raise taxes on workers or we have to reduce benefits to our senior citizens; and neither one of those are very desirable.

Now, what has happened in the budget plan, we heard the President say that he was going to put Social Security first in our consideration. And when we listened to the rest of the State of the Union address, Social Security first, and then we heard about a whole series of new spending programs.

Now I think it is important to understand that when we say we are going to put Social Security first and then we describe a whole raft of new spending programs that what is actually happening is Social Security is not actually being put first but someplace else down the list.

So let us look at what happened in the State of the Union address and in the budget that the President presented this week.

The extra Social Security money, that \$98 billion, it is still going in the government checkbook. We are still spending virtually all of the money out of that big government checkbook.

But the President said, okay, we are going to run a surplus for the first time; and that is good. We should not downgrade this or say this is all bad. The good news is that this is the first time since 1969 that, even with the Social Security money, they got to a point where they balanced the budget, according to Washington definition.

Here is what the President proposed. He proposed to keep putting the \$98 billion into the big government fund. When we are all done spending all the money that we spend for a year out of the big government checkbook, whatever is left over we will put aside for Social Security.

Today I sat in the Committee on the Budget, and I had a chance to listen to Mr. Raines describe exactly what was going to happen. I think it is very, very important that my colleagues understand the \$98 billion still goes into the big government checkbook; the money gets spent out of the big government checkbook. The only things we are talking about is that small surplus or \$9 billion, that is the leftover amount out of this checkbook; and it does not even get put into the Social Security Trust Fund. What they actually are going to do is pay down debt with that money.

Now, paying down debt is good. Getting to a balanced budget is good. Spending less money than we have in

our checkbook, that is good. But the idea that the only thing we are going to do for Social Security is put the leftovers down there, that is not okay, and that is the reason I am here tonight talking about the Social Security issue.

About 2 years ago we wrote in my office a bill called the Social Security Preservation Act, and I am happy to say many people on both sides of the aisle are now cosponsors on the Social Security Preservation Act.

Here is what it does. The Social Security Preservation Act simply takes that \$98 billion and directs it straight down here into the Social Security Trust Fund. What we want to do is cut off that cash flow into the big government checkbook so that Social Security, in fact, is treated first.

Now what this would do is put all \$98 billion down into the trust fund this year; and that would mean that, instead of reporting a \$9 billion surplus, we would instead be reporting approximately an \$87 billion deficit.

I do not want to take anything away from the people that have done a lot of hard work, good hard work, out in this city to get us to a "balanced budget." We need to understand, in Washington when they say "balanced budget," what they mean is the dollars coming into the Federal Government is equal to the dollars going back out from the Federal Government. By that definition, their budget was balanced here for the first time since 1969; and, again, that is good. That is important, and it is good. But what we really need to do is start putting this money right straight down here in the Social Security Trust Fund so we honestly reflect the situation that exists out here.

I come from the private sector. Before 1995, I never held a public office. In the private sector, when we ran a business, if we would have taken the pension money, put it in our general account and spent all the money out of the general account and put an IOU in the trust fund, the way Social Security is working today, they would have arrested us in the private sector. It would be absolutely illegal to do the same thing in the private sector that we do with Social Security today.

So I am here tonight to call on my colleagues to join us in the Social Security Preservation Act. I do not consider it an Einstein kind of bill. It is pretty common sense, pretty straightforward. It simply says the extra money coming in for Social Security ought to be put down here in the Social Security Trust Fund. It is bill H.R. 857, and I am asking tonight that my colleagues join me in this bill.

We have been working at this for 3 years out of my office, and I am happy to say it has now come to the forefront. Let us not accept anything less than truly putting Social Security first as we look at the budget this year. There is no good reason at this point in time that we cannot be putting true money, real dollars, down here in the

Social Security Trust Fund so that our senior citizens are once again safe.

I should add in this conversation, this is not only about preserving Social Security for our senior citizens. This is about people in their 40s and 50s who are expecting to get Social Security when they retire; and, equally important, it is about those same people in their 30s and 40s and 50s that, if this is not done and we reach a point where there is not enough money coming in for Social Security to pay the benefits, that choice between cutting Social Security benefits for our senior citizens or raising taxes for workers is going to be a very tough choice. And it is something that we need to head off right now by simply doing what the Social Security system was set up to do in the first place.

I think it is time that H.R. 857, our Social Security Preservation Act, gets brought to the floor of the House of Representatives; and I think it is time that we have enough cosponsors of this bill. We have got 85 or 90.

And, again, I want to emphasize that there are both Republicans and Democrats on this bill. This is not a partisan issue. This is an issue about what is right for the seniors of this country, what is right for the workers of this country, and what is right as we look forward into the future as it relates to Social Security.

Having said this, I think it is important that we look at where we are at in this budget before we hear lots of new proposals for spending.

If I could ask to bring those other charts and just take a little look back on where we have been and a little look forward of where we are going to. And, again, for any of my colleagues who have seen parts of this presentation before, we have updated these charts.

I always show the first one, which we have not changed. That is the growing debt facing our country. What this shows is the growth in debt from 1960 all the way up to where we are today. We will notice the debt is still rising today. Even though in Washington we are hearing that the budget is balanced, most people would think that when the budget is balanced the debt stops growing.

But, again, I talk about the Social Security issue. Remember that even when the budget is balanced, that is to say the dollars coming into Washington are equal to the dollars going out of Washington, and again remember that is the first time in nearly 30 years that has happened, that is good. But even when we get to that point, there is still a debt to the Social Security Trust Fund. That is why we see that, even though we are hearing about a balanced budget, the debt is still rising.

I think it is also important to understand just how big this debt is. For anybody that has seen parts of this presentation before, a week ago I brought the numbers out here that were approximately a year and a half

old, and it was \$5.3 trillion. The reality is the debt, the United States Government debt, has now grown to \$5.5 trillion.

Let me put that another way. The United States Government has spent \$5.5 trillion on behalf of the American people more than what they collected in taxes.

That is an awful big number. So let me translate that into English. If we divide that debt by the number of people in the United States of America, the debt is now \$20,400 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America. Or, for a family of five, like mine, the debt is now \$102,000.

The kicker of this whole thing is really the bottom line here. We see a lot of people say, "So what if we are in debt?" But the "so what" part is that we are paying interest on that debt; and a family of five, like mine, or any group of five in America, they are actually paying \$580 a month every month to pay nothing but the Federal interest on that debt.

We need to put this in perspective of where we are at today and what is really going on in this country as we listen to budget discussions.

We saw the President on TV recently where he put that big zero in there; the budget is balanced. We need to not forget that this debt is still out there and that our families are paying \$580 a month every month to pay nothing but interest on the debt.

And for any of my colleagues who think their families are not paying that much every month to pay interest on the debt, just think about walking in the store and buying a pair of shoes for your kids. The store owner makes a small profit when you buy that pair of shoes and, of course, part of that profit gets sent out here to Washington, D.C.

□ 1945

As a matter of fact, \$1 out of every 6 that the United States Government collects from taxpayers gets spent on nothing other than interest on this Federal debt.

The beauty is we are going forward. And they start talking about running surpluses, and as we eventually start running true surpluses, surpluses that allow for the Social Security money to be set aside, if we start running true surpluses, we can start paying this debt down.

A second bill I would like to mention tonight is called the National Debt Repayment Act. What the National Debt Repayment Act is really the second part of restoring Social Security. It is much like a home mortgage payment.

I come from the home building business before I was elected to office, so it is kind of like the same thing we used to do with folks when they moved into a house. This debt is much like a home mortgage for many people. What we suggested we do in the National Debt Repayment Act is simply set up a home mortgage-type repayment plan and pay the debt off.

Under our plan, under the National Debt Repayment Act, the entire Federal debt would be paid off by the year 2026, and maybe sooner. It could go faster. We use two-thirds of any surpluses to go to debt repayment. We dedicate the other one-third to the other problem that I think is very real in this country, and that is taxes are too high. So two-thirds of any surpluses that materialize go to debt repayment.

I have dedicated much of this tonight to Social Security. Let me talk about how this affects the Social Security System. The theft of that Social Security Trust Fund money, the taking of that money and spending it on other government programs, that has been going on since 1983. There is about \$600 billion that is supposed to be in the Social Security kitty today that is not there.

The first thing we need to do for Social Security is what I described earlier, the Social Security Preservation Act. We need to stop taking the money out this year, \$9 billion. We need to put that money into the Social Security Trust Fund. But that doesn't solve the problem of that \$600 billion that has been taken since 1983. So the second thing we need to do is recognize that \$600 billion is part of this \$5.5 trillion.

Now, as we repay this debt, our National Debt Repayment Act would put the money back into the Social Security Trust Fund. Let me say that again, because it is a little confusing, because it is a little difficult to understand that this \$5.5 trillion, it represents a whole bunch of different things. But one of the things that makes up this \$5.5 trillion is the Social Security Trust Fund money, the \$600 billion that has been taken out since 1983. So under our National Debt Repayment Act, as we are paying down the Federal debt, we are also restoring the Social Security Trust Fund.

That bill again is called the National Debt Repayment Act, and what it does is dedicate two-thirds of any surpluses to reducing the debt, paying the debt back, like a home mortgage repayment plan, and the other one-third to another big problem in our country, which is taxes are too high on the American people. So two-thirds to debt repayment, one-third to lowering taxes.

Now, as we start repaying this Federal debt, I think a couple other things happen. First, as the debt goes down, the amount of interest we need to collect from the taxpayers goes down. So as the debt goes down, we should be able to provide tax relief to the workers out there.

The overall bill when we look at the National Debt Repayment Act, it pays off the debt in its entirety by the year 2026, so we can give this Nation to our children debt-free; it restores the Social Security Trust Fund. It puts the money back into Social Security that has been taken out. And for the people in the work force today, there will be

no need to collect the additional tax money, because we will not need the money to pay interest on the debt as we keep paying this thing down.

It is also significant to just take a look at some of the things that have changed from before to where we are at today. This will probably make a little more sense right-side up than it does upside down. I think it is important to take a glance at least briefly at this chart to understand how it is we got to where we are today.

I have heard a lot of discussions about who gets credit; it is the Democrats, the President, it is the Democrats in the House, it is the Republicans in the House. I think it is time as Americans we recognize it really doesn't matter who gets credit. The fact is we have reached for the first time in nearly 30 years a point where the United States Government did not spend more money than they had in their checkbook.

We still got problems. The Social Security Trust Fund is a huge problem. It needs to be put first, and it needs to be put truly first, not first after we create a whole bunch of new spending programs.

I would like to show this chart, because it helps people understand just exactly how we got to where we are today.

When I took office in 1995, we had just lived through the 1993 tax increase and more broken promises of a balanced budget than I care to think about. You can start back to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act in 1985 or 1987, or the budget deal in 1990, or the 1993 deal where they raised taxes significantly. The bottom line is the theory was that if we could take more money out of the pockets of the American people, the people that were here in office, they were going to take more money out of the pockets of the American people, and somehow if they took enough money from the American people, that would lead us to a balanced budget.

When we were elected in 1995, that changed. That theory that raising taxes was going to balance the budget was thrown out. As a matter of fact, that 1993 tax increase is why a lot of us are here. The American people did not want higher taxes and more Washington spending. They wanted a balanced budget by controlling the growth of Washington spending. They wanted less Washington and more money in their own pockets. They wanted less Washington, a balanced budget and lower taxes. That is what they wanted. That is why there was a changeover in 1995. In 1995, before we got here, the spending growth rate in Washington was 5.2 percent. That is this red column. That is how fast spending was going up each year on an average basis over the previous seven years.

Since we have been here, it is going up by 3.2 percent. So the growth of Washington spending has been dramatically slowed over the last three year period of time. It is down by 40 percent.

The good news is the year we just completed, it was not only below 3.2, but actually down to 2.6 percent. It is the first time in a long time it has been actually under the rate of inflation.

Let me say that again so it makes a little more sense. The rate of growth of spending in Washington was actually less than the rate of growth of inflation in our country. So Washington did actually shrink, perhaps for the first time in a generation, last year in real dollar terms.

Now, do not let anybody mistake me saying that that means Washington is small enough. Washington still takes way too much money from the American people, they spend too much money out here, and there is all kinds of waste that should be eliminated. So I am not trying to lead anybody to believe the job is done. This job is not done. We have a long ways to go.

Are we on the right track? Slowing the growth of Washington spending by 40 percent in two years, getting us to a point where we actually have a balanced budget and spent less money than we have in our check book for the first time since 1969? That is all good stuff.

We need to keep this in perspective of the Social Security Trust Fund, we need to understand we have a long ways to go, we need to recognize the progress that has been made, but at the same time we are recognizing that progress, we need to recognize how far we still have to go.

There is one other topic I would like to briefly discuss today. We talked about the past and how we had broken promises and how we had tax increases from 1993. We have talked about our new theory of less Washington, leading us to a balanced budget and more money in the pockets of the people.

I would like to talk specifically about that more money in the pockets of the people, because last year, for the first time, taxes were cut for the American people.

I was somewhat shocked this weekend, I was at a particular place in our district, we had about 200 people there, in our state, we had about 200 people there, not many people actually knew that the tax cut package had been passed into law and was available right now in January 1998 for virtually any taxpayer with a child under the age of 17 earning less than \$110,000 a year.

Right now, today, January 1998, if a child under the age of 17 is in your family, you can fill out a new W-4 form and start taking home \$33 a month more right now, this January. It is a \$400 per child tax credit.

Now, if you do not do anything, you are still going to get the tax credit, but you are not going to get it until 1999. By going in and filling out a new W-4 form, any parent or constituent of ours or my colleagues out there in America can literally start taking home \$33 a month more right now. The \$33 a month is the \$400 tax credit divided up amongst the 12 months. All we have to

do, all that has to be done, is a new W-4 has to be filled out.

Let me make that very clear. If we have a family in our districts that has a child under the age of 17, and they go in and fill out a new W-4, and then they look at their December paycheck and they compare it to their January paycheck, their January paycheck should be \$33 bigger than their December paycheck. For a family with three kids, that is \$100 a month. All a family has to do is simply go in and fill out a new W-4, and a family with three kids under the age of 17 starts taking home \$100 a month more immediately.

There is more to the tax cut package. We put education as a top priority. If you have a freshman or sophomore in college, in virtually all cases they are eligible for a \$1,500 tax credit.

Again, let me translate that. Because if the people do not do anything, they are going to get the \$1,500 dollars back at the end of the year, April of 1999. But you can start getting that money back in your pocket right now.

The college students I know, they have got college tuition bills to pay right now and in the fall of this year. If a senior in high school is looking ahead to college, that college bill comes due in fall of this year, not in April of 1999.

So what the parents need to do is go in and change the W-4 forms. If you are going to have a freshman or sophomore in college, you start taking home \$125 a month right now, January 1998. There is no reason to wait.

There is another problem with not doing it. If you do not fill out a new W-4 form to take that extra money into their home right now today, that means that Washington is going to be getting \$33 per month per child, or \$125 a month for a freshman or sophomore in college, and that money is going to be coming out here to Washington, instead of the people keeping it in their own homes. When Washington sees this big pile of money that actually belongs out there in the homes of the American people, when Washington sees that big pile of money, they are going to want to spend it.

So the problem with this waiting until 1999 to get the tax credit is that Washington gets the people's money in the interim, and it is very difficult in this city when people see this money to get them to not spend it.

So it would be a tremendous help to all of the elected officials, all of my colleagues here and myself in Washington, if the people would very simply keep their own money in their homes. For juniors and seniors in college, it is 20 percent of the first \$5,000 cost, up to \$1,000 total.

If folks own their own home, and I am going on with some of the other tax cut provisions that are included, if folks own their own home and they sell it, they have been there for two years or longer, there is no longer any Federal taxes due in the vast majority of the cases.

If someone has made an investment in stocks and bonds, and, again, I spend

a lot of time with people in Wisconsin, and as I ask people in Wisconsin, I ask rooms full of people how many own a stock or bond or mutual fund, and virtually every hand in the room goes up. We are in a day and an age where people have made investments into stocks and bonds and mutual funds. I talk to them about the fact if they make a profit, and I tell them I hope they make a profit, I do not know of anybody who invests in stocks or bonds or mutual funds with the intent of losing money, I hope they make a profit. That means the economy is good. That is what this is all about.

So when they make that profit, instead of sending 28 cents out of every dollar to Washington, they now only send 20 cents, because capital gains is reduced from 28 percent to 20, and if you earn less than \$41,000 a year, it was reduced from 15 percent down to 10. These are very significant changes.

Then I talk to a lot of folks in the room where the kids are grown and gone and they are starting to think seriously about retirement. I talk to them about the Roth IRA. It is a new kind of IRA where you can put \$2,000 per person per year into this account, and you do not get the tax break up front, but all of the interest and earnings that accumulates on that \$2,000 between whenever you put it in and retirement, it accumulates absolutely tax-free, and when you take it out there is no taxes due. A monumental change in the Tax Code.

One other thing to mention in the Tax Code change, there are a lot of middle income families in America today that, for whatever reason, to find out they can't have their own children and would like to adopt a child. I think this is a very important, very significant Tax Code change.

In America today, it costs about \$10,000 to get through the legal red tape to adopt a child. So what we have done in the Tax Code is provided a \$5,000 adoption tax credit, so that if a middle income family finds themselves in a situation where they cannot have their own children and they would like to adopt a child, that tax credit is now available to assist and to help in that particular situation.

I have talked about a lot of issues here tonight. If I could close with where we started basically, and that is the Social Security issue, I think it is very, very important as the people listen to the debate here in Washington and my colleagues talk about Social Security and putting Social Security first, I think it is very important that we remember Social Security is collecting this year alone \$98 billion more than it is paying out our seniors in benefits. That money is being spent on other government programs right now. At this point the proposal is simply to give the leftovers to Social Security.

It does not have to be that way. The Social Security Preservation Act would require that that \$98 billion, not IOU's, real money, gets put directly

into the Social Security Trust Fund, so Social Security would once again be safe and solvent for our senior citizens.

There is \$600 billion that has been taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund and spent on other government programs between 1983 and today. Our National Debt Repayment Act, we do not have to ignore that money. It is not gone. We do not have to say we cannot pay that money back.

That \$600 billion that has been taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund, that is all part of the national debt, the \$5.5 trillion. All we have to do is pass the National Debt Repayment Act and as we repay that Federal debt, we find ourselves in a position where part of that debt is the Social Security Trust Fund, so the money gets back into the Social Security Trust Fund.

So tonight I am encouraging my colleagues to join me in two separate bills, the Social Security Preservation Act, which truly would put Social Security first, and the National Debt Repayment Act, which would pay off the entire Federal debt by the year 2026, so our children inherit a debt free Nation. It would restore the Social Security Trust Fund, so Social Security would again be solvent for our senior citizens, and it would lower taxes, taking one-third of any surpluses and dedicating it towards tax reduction.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MANTON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and tomorrow, on account of district business.

Mr. GILLMOR (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for January 27, on account of the birth of a granddaughter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PEASE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes on February 5.

Mr. GEKAS for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clement) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Skelton.
Mr. Lantos.
Mr. Pascrell.
Mr. Berman.
Mr. Farr of California.
Mr. Stark.
Mr. Deutsch.
Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Manton.
Mr. Schumer.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mr. Kleczka.
Mr. Fazio of California.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pease) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Talent.
Mr. Radanovich.
Mr. Gilman.
Mr. Ramstad.
Mr. Solomon.
Mr. Sensenbrenner.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Miller of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen.
Mr. Bilirakis.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. Packard.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Combest.
Mr. Kanjorski.
Mr. Blagojevich.
Mr. Payne.
Mr. Knollenberg.
Mr. Kildee.
Mr. Kind.
Mr. Filner.
Mr. McIntosh, in two instances.
Mr. Oberstar.
Mr. Torres.
Mr. Baker.
Mr. Gillmor.
Ms. Stabenow.
Mr. Farr of California.
Mr. Clyburn.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Neumann) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Clyburn, in three instances.
Mrs. Mink of Hawaii.
Mr. Thune.

□ 2000

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1998, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6724. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule—Peanuts Marketed in the United States; Relaxation of Handling Regulations [Docket Nos. FV97-997-1 IFR and FV97-998-1 IFR] received January 22, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6725. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV98-905-2 IFR] received January 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6726. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Hazel-nuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 1997-98 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV98-982-1 IFR] received January 23, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6727. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida and Imported Tomatoes; Final Rule to Change Minimum Size and Size Designation Requirements [Docket No. FV97-966-1 FR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6728. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Revision to Container Requirements [Docket No. FV98-925-2 IFR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6729. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al; Temporary Suspension of Proviso for Exporting Juice and Juice Concentrate; Establishment of Regulations for Handler Diversion [Docket No. FV97-930-4 IFR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6730. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Florida Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV97-905-1 FIR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6731. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Temporary Suspension of Continuing Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV98-925-1 IFR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6732. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV98-959-1 IFR] received January 9, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6733. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Humane Treatment of Dogs and Cats; Wire Flooring [Docket No. 95-100-2] (RIN: 0579-AA78) received January 23, 1998,